



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/782,280	02/19/2004	Krishna Mangipudi	20496/1 CON 4251		
7590 04/05/2005			EXAMINER		
Brian L. Michaelis, Esq.			DONAGHUE, LARRY D		
	Fred & Gesmer				
18th Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
One Financial Center			2154		
Boston, MA 02111			DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	ion No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/782,2	:80	MANGIPUDI ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examine	r	Art Unit					
			Oonaghue	2154					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
Status									
1)🖾	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <u>10/18/2004</u> .							
2a)□	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action is a	non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims									
4)⊠ 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
Application Papers									
9)[The specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner.							
10)	0)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
11)□	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				•				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 									
Attachmen	t(s)								
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Inforn	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/19/2004</u> .		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:		D-152)				

Art Unit: 2154

- 1. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination.
- 2. Claims 4-11 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 10/18/2004.
- 3. The information disclosure statement filed 02/19/2004 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because (5) Each publication listed in an information disclosure statement must be identified by publisher, author (if any), title, relevant pages of the publication, date, and place of publication. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1). Only those reference where this applicable were not considered.
- 4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claim(s) 1 of patent #6,728,748 contain(s) every element of claim(s)1 of the instant application and as such anticipate(s) claim(s)1of the instant application.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or anticipated by, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). " ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

Art Unit: 2154

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 7. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jin et al. (6,189,033).
- 8. Jin et al., taught the invention as claimed including a method for implementing class of service among a plurality of clients (11a-11n) sending requests seeking access to sites hosted on a plurality of back-end servers (108a-n), comprising the steps of grouping at least one of said plurality of back-end servers into a respective one of a plurality of service classes (col. 8, lines 32-45); receiving a client request for host access at a front end processor (100); selecting a class of service from said plurality of service classes according to at least one selected parameter of said request (col. 6, lines 19-26); and distributing said request to a back-end server in said selected class of service according to the load of each of said at least one of said back-end servers in the selected service class (col. 6, lines 11-59).

As to daim 2, Jin et al. taught the least one selected parameter is/are selected from a group consisting of user authentication, virtual site level class of service and client level class of service; wherein a user authentication

Art Unit: 2154

identifies a subscribed class for an authenticated user, a virtual site level class of service is determined by host name and selected protocol; and a client level class of service is determined as a function of the request/transaction, service/protocol, authenticated user, URL, destination port, domain of origin, source IP, destination IP, and application requested (col. 6, line 24-26 IP address mask).

As to claim 3, Jin et al. taught step of distributing the request according to the load further includes a load balancing algorithm selected from the group consisting of weighted percentage; round robin; CPU availability; least connections; and probabilistic (col. 6, lines 66 –col. 7, line 2).

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ottati

6,704,764

Dollin et al.

6,112,236

Eilert et al.

6,760,910

Pandely et al.

"Supporting Quality of Service in HTTP Servers"

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Larry D Donaghue whose telephone number is 571-272-3962. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2154

LARRY D. DONAGHUE PRIMARY EXAMINED